

Japan and Modern Asian Art

John Clark

Australia Research Council, Professorial Fellow



คำสำคัญ ญี่ปุ่น, ศิลปะร่วมสมัย, การแลกเปลี่ยนทางศิลปะ, นิทรรศการศิลปะ

บทคัดย่อ

ในตอนต้นของทศวรรษที่ 2010 เมื่อศิลปะร่วมสมัยและศิลปะสมัยใหม่ของจีนมีชัยชนะเหนือตลาดการค้าศิลปะและถูกบรรจุอยู่ในตารางการแสดงนิทรรศการระดับนานาชาติ เป็นการยากที่จะรับรู้ที่ญี่ปุ่นในทศวรรษที่ 1990 ได้นำเสนอศิลปะกันอย่างยิ่งใหญ่โดยที่เริ่มต้นมาตั้งแต่ทศวรรษที่ 1950 แล้วและได้ขยายอย่างต่อเนื่องจนกลายเป็นความสนใจในศิลปะร่วมสมัยของประเทศเอเชีย ผมได้บรรยายหัวข้อนี้ในปีค.ศ. 2001 และคิดว่าผมอยากจะอัปเดตเอกสารการบรรยายนี้สักวันหนึ่ง แต่ความที่มันมีนิทรรศการและศิลปินเกิดขึ้นอย่างมากมายจนเกินไปในประเทศญี่ปุ่นทำให้ยากเกินไป ศิลปินหลายๆ คนที่เราคุ้นเคยที่ผมเอ่ยถึงในบทความของผมกลายเป็นศิลปินที่มีชื่อเสียงในโลกศิลปะของญี่ปุ่นในขณะนี้ และศิลปินเอเชียอีก

หลายๆ คนที่มีรายชื่ออยู่ในภาคผนวกได้กลายเป็นที่รู้จักในนิทรรศการระดับนานาชาติทุกวันนี้  
หลายๆ ปัญหาที่ผมได้นำเสนอในการรับรู้ของคนญี่ปุ่นที่มีต่อศิลปะเอเชียสมัยใหม่ยังคงดำเนิน  
อยู่จนถึงปัจจุบัน ดังนั้นเราจะสามารถเห็นได้ว่า การหมุนเวียนของศิลปะเอเชียสมัยใหม่ใน  
นิทรรศการเวียนมาเล่ระดับนานาชาติได้เปลี่ยนปัญหาเหล่านี้ได้มากหรือน้อยเพียงไร บทความ  
นี้จึงเป็นการสร้างภาพรวมย้อนรอยแบบโบราณคดีของศิลปะร่วมสมัยและเป็นบทความที่ผมหวัง  
ว่าจะได้นำเอารายละเอียดของการนำเสนอความเป็นญี่ปุ่นกลับมาอย่างเป็นระบบในแบบที่ผู้ที่  
สนใจสามารถติดตามและค้นคว้าต่อได้

This chapter was written in 2001 for a public lecture and is published here for the first time

This final chapter is a short, methodologically limited excursion into investigating what is a large question, not without practical importance for Australia and its art world: the structure of Japanese perceptions of and relations with 'modern Asian art'. It is based on a re-reading of a number of catalogues and other texts in Japanese, and on personal observations over a number of years when I was engaged on other research in Japan, chiefly in the 1990s. My grasp of the literature cannot claim to be comprehensive since at the time of writing I am restricted to the texts on hand in Sydney at the time of writing.<sup>1</sup>

My essay is prompted by two minor but indicative 'events'. The first was noticing on a recent visit to Japan that in some Japanese texts a perceptual equivalence was posited between 'Japan' and 'Australia' in the modernity of their art institutions. This also implied a similar status or position in relation to the exhibition of recent Asian art.<sup>2</sup> The second was hearing an anecdote relayed by another 'Asian' curatorial colleague that there was initially to have been no selection of an artist from Australia for the forthcoming Yokohama Triennale.<sup>3</sup> It seemed, to that observer, that Japan wished to play the 'White Asian', and occupy a position of curatorial importance equivalent to the old Euramerican centers. This intention might be upset, according to that observer, if too much prominence was given to the other and possibly more identifiably 'White' tribal of note in the Asia-Pacific.

Of course such labeling of Japanese perceptions of themselves as 'white' by an outsider are the extension to Japanese of a former structure of colonial understanding which is not rare among Japan's Asian geographical neighbours. But it is a fact that since the first public opinion analyses were made of Japanese views of foreign peoples in the 1950s,<sup>4</sup> Japanese have tended to compare themselves against 'superior' European countries and also particularly the USA, in terms which may be extended to real-world relations of dominance and being dominated. Japanese have tended to associate themselves with the superior or dominant powers. There is also a Japanese view, found among Japanese bureaucrats and intellectuals, and also among curators, that if the 19<sup>th</sup> century was the time of 'Western' dominance then the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be that of Asia.<sup>5</sup> By implication, although there be debate about what is 'Asian' and whether or how what is 'Japanese' plays a part in it, Asia would soon be setting political and cultural agendas not only for itself in a post-colonial situation, but also by extension, for the world.

In Japan, before one person exhibitions of artists from Korea, China, and later SE Asia at commercial or loan galleries,<sup>6</sup> exhibitions of modern Asian art have been initiated, held at, or otherwise supported by the Japan Foundation's Asia Cultural Center (from 1995), whose previous incarnation was the Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center (from 1990). It is significant that this center specifically excludes Australia and other Pacific or Oceania countries from the purview of its exhibitions,<sup>7</sup> as indeed does the Fukuoka Asian Art Museum which opened in 1999.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the subject of this chapter concerns not only a large national unit and some perceptions held by various sub-groups of its population, it also concerns administrative categories for achieving the goals of local and national institutions.

Why art? What art?

One might ask in the scheme of quotidian political and cultural dominance, why art might occupy a special place, particularly for government organizations. In

Japan this would appear to be because 'Art always runs along with the intellectual tendencies of a period and sensitively anticipates its future'.<sup>9</sup> Art may be thus conceived of as an index, a litmus paper for social change in the cultural domain, and as such the wish to understand its trajectory is part of sensible regional understanding if not participation which can be facilitated by government agency. But for the Japan Foundation and its Asia Cultural Center in particular the three symposia it held in the 1990s indicated three issues. In 2000, these were according to the Japan Asian Cultural Center coordinator Furuichi Yasuko:

1. *Size of the problem of the conceptual definition of the terms 'art', 'modern' and 'Asia';*
2. *The potentially repressive authority of sites with modern institutions Japan, Australia which were on a level and scale undeveloped elsewhere in the region;*
3. *The forum of those involved in art of the Asia Pacific which was constituted through the 1990s, should not just be a network remaining within its own scope, or, put differently, within its own body, but must be a site broadly open to other regions.*<sup>10</sup>

Some Japanese cultural institutions were then closely aware since the beginning of the 1990s, but more intensely so thereafter, that beyond the issue of whether or not Japan might be seen to dominate in any area because of its economic wealth or the policy-directedness of its officials, the very terms of the field in which they might be interested or intervene were problematic. I have seen no statement that Japanese were aware they might be creating the field itself by the defining powers of their own activity, but that awareness may lie behind the second of Furuichi's issues above. Here again it is interesting that Japan should be paired with Australia. It is probably too early to make more than an impressionistic comparison. But Australia is a country with a population less than one-tenth of Japan's, and despite the prominence and innovation of its Asia-Pacific Biennale from 1993 or the intimacy of its artists with art practice in different Asian countries, it hardly has the same scale of activity in the field of modern Asian art

as could be seen in Japan, as the list of texts and exhibitions at the end of this essay may indicate. Is the comparison made because Australia's geographical location yet cultural difference from its Asian region in some way resembles Japan's? Or is it a perception based on 'development' and its corollary, institutional strength in the art world? <sup>11</sup>

Perhaps because of a fear of being accused of hegemonism, perhaps because of a genuine humility about lack knowledge coupled with a wish to learn, many Japanese curators have been restrained in proposing Japan as an example of a soon-to-be defined 'Asian Modernity', realizing that the most important underlying issue lies in the understanding of modernity itself. Japanese modernity cannot be easily generalized as an example of a non-Euramerican modernity because of its special historical and geographical distancing from other cultural centers as much as its modern history of imperial wars in Asia. These remain problematic in cultural relations the less Japanese politicians are able to recognize the gap between the realities of these wars and their perception by those on whom they were inflicted. <sup>12</sup> But Japanese modernity still might be relevant to Asia if it might be fitted into a more general scheme which accepts its historical relevance and particularity, especially in art. <sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, many curators and officials have identified the operational problem for them in the defining of an Asian modernity and its implications for cultural policy or exhibition and collection practice. For example Ushiroshôji Masahiro (then of Fukuoka Asian Art Museum):

*The modernity of Asia in art was a process which materialized the institutions and concept of 'the modern' which was of Western European origin, (as similarly were 'art museum', art exhibition', and 'artist') and at the same time that process produced what is 'not art' at the periphery of 'art'. Thus the (Fukuoka) Asian Art Museum considers it should pay attention to plastic expressions peripheralized through the birth of 'art', and re-examine the modernity of Asian art from the side of what was 'not art'. <sup>14</sup>*

This wise position also allows the recontextualization of whatever the 'modern' is thought to be by the forms and representations from which such a modern art

arose. As these were not Euramerican it is unlikely that the 'modern' to which they gave rise or through which they were expressed would itself be definable along Euramerican lines, even if the sites where they arose were subject to cultural forces which may have had Euramerican origins, let alone have been cloaked in Euramerican forms. This is shown by the exhibition or collection of for example, painted rickshaws from Bangla Desh at Fukuoka. That this same innovation had been preceded by their similar exhibition at the Museum of Mankind in London, unmentioned in the Japanese catalogues, hints that modern art exhibitions are not merely serving to define the 'modern', they are also serving to re-define the culturally 'other'. That is the exhibition of 'modern Asian art' in Japan is serving curatorial and artistic functions, but it is also serving more broadly anthropological purposes. Incidentally, there is nothing peculiarly 'Japanese' about this anthropological exploration, and similar examples may also be adduced from the *Magiciens de la Terre* exhibition in 1989 or the Queensland Asia-Pacific Biennales.

#### Language of exchange: Japanese, English, or their language

But aside from the intellectual and operational difficulties of defining modernity one remaining difficulty is that of appraising modern Asian art from a given standard which requires talking about overall for an imaginative criticism. As Misusawa has noticed,<sup>15</sup> that whilst it might seem merely a technical issue of communication, there is an implicit control of the direction of discourse at Japan Foundation symposia in the 1990s by the use of English as a medium. In my own observation this may also be a problem when Japanese curators meet Asian artists, since they are usually constrained to use English to talk with them, unless there is a local interpreter available. Certainly this is not merely a 'field' problem. Incommensurable concepts between say Javanese and Japanese may become more so for mediation of a third language, English, whatever the historical facility of English in serving such mediator functions. For as Mizusawa notes, what in Asia might be impeded (on the level of discourse) by use of English translation is

*..a pent-up, irrepressible particularity', in whose stead may be inserted the illusion of the possible universality of 'the modern', one born through the phantasmagoria of splendid international exhibitions.*<sup>16</sup>

This push and pull across a common but mutually foreign lingua franca is a fairly familiar phenomenon from both pre-modern Asia (Persian was probably used by Marco Polo to communicate with the Mongols in China) or modern Asia (English may be the language of public space in the Philippines but Tagalog or local speech remains that of the home). But Mizusawa also points to the shift in perceptions due to the process of encountering Asian art among curators:

*From the 1990s the intoxication and excitement of participating in Asian art now may well leave a hangover headache. This participation first indicated Asia as a competitive value to the West (=anti-Western), and when that was over-emphasized it became the autonomy of representative values (=Asianism), and thereafter stressed the regional scatter of values (=plural Asias).*<sup>17</sup>

He sees that the lack of infrastructure in the region increases the tendency for talent to become nomadic, since artists move or make works for where they can be exhibited and the gatekeepers or publics of those sites. This may be the reason why through the work of such nomadic artists Asia appears as a scene in a nostalgic reverie, which one might add could facilitate its acceptance by a foreign audience. Mizusawa thinks there is no guarantee that art will be of a region if it does flow into the life of the region. The question then becomes one of what 'modern art' is necessary, and I suppose the difference will lie between regions whose art publics may have increasingly globalized perspectives, or on the contrary, of those who reject, resist or are marginalized by such globalization.

### Unequal nature of exchanges

If the 'modern' is so conceptually fraught and the means for conceptualising so

compromised because of their origin outside 'Asia', Japanese have particular conceptual problems with 'Asia' as such because of the fraught history of their own relationships with it. For 'Japan' itself cannot be a neutral term in the space of the reception of the 'modern' in other Asian contexts. As Furuichi notes,

*when appraised in the binary terms 'Japan and Asia', such understanding of modern Asian art may be seen as cultural hegemonism linked to memories of past wars, casting a shadow on art exchanges...*<sup>18</sup>

The raising of the spectre of hegemonism seems like the negation of an authentic inner Asian identity. The issue of identity has also been taken up by Tatehata :

*..be it the mutual view from within Asia, the view from Euramerica or from Australia, we (Japanese) have repeatedly made an issue of the identity of this region*<sup>19</sup>

Tatehata is against the absorption of artistic identity into a national or regional identity and wishes to return to the discourse of artistic practice itself as a way of privileging selection of works for exhibition and interpretation. This may be one way out of the focus, as he sees it, on 'Asian' or national identities from outside.

Where is the meeting, what is the nature of the site of meeting?

One way out of the situation of dominance or inequality is to plan exhibitions which introduce the modern art of Asia within Japan which according to Nakamura Hideki are premised on

*....a "hybrid" intention (J: konsei, English also given in the original) where the art situation in Japan tries to form itself through dialogue and encounter with the modern art of Asia.*<sup>20</sup>

The purpose of having art exchanges and the exhibition of Asian art in Japan is thus to hybridise Japanese contemporary art.



Nakamura sees hybrids as being required not only between modern Japanese art and modern Asian art, but also between western spiritual structure and eastern spiritual structure, western modernity and non-western modernity, and between the modern period and earlier periods. But Nakamura later warns against binarism, since previous hybrids have always been unequal because hybridity was pushed from a western position. He goes on to distinguish the 'internal dialogue self' born from an encounter between internal others, and the 'rearguard self' which integrates the self by observing the quarrels between internal others.<sup>21</sup> Nakamura uses this model to explore the strengths and weaknesses of western and eastern self where the former tends to become one with the viewpoint from which it gazes at the self, the latter integrates time and space in one body. Nakamura seems to have become more explicit about whatever hybridity might be, compared with his earlier version in the 1999 symposium,<sup>22</sup> and whilst reference is made from time to time to existing hybridity in Japanese society being progressively revealed by the necessarily hybrid relations with non-Japanese resident in Japan, Nakamura's tentative in the art world is not so common. Any perusal of the interviews with the four Japanese curators for the Yokohama Triennale on its website indicates a pre-occupation with high, autonomous art practice which now centres on Japan as a site for the appraisal and distribution of value on a scale and in a structure given by previous internationally dominant art worlds. For as Tatehata Akira puts it,

*Japan has sent artists to participate in many international exhibitions in the past and they have been well received. Now it is time to establish our own place for transmitting a message to the world, a place for communication between artists and a place for communication between Japan and other regions.*<sup>23</sup>

Tatehata thinks the Yokohama Triennale will

*...exert a strong centripetal force and bring together many kinds of information in a concentrated form. It will energize the Japanese art scene, and it will lead to interchanges with other countries that will also affect the international art world. Through this exhibition we can send an artistic*

*message out to the world from Japan rather than simply using foreign art.*<sup>24</sup>

### Where is 'Japan' in the exchanges

Tatehata's position and its distance from Nakamura's clearly raises the issue of what the new Japanese centre can do in international art. This perhaps comes from a consciousness born from participation in Asian art related activities in the 1990s. For 'getting involved in Asian art is certainly not a local matter and in the area of a world art proceeding towards globalization, it carries one end of the process which questions universal values'.<sup>25</sup>

In this penumbra of positions it may be conceived that 'Japan' moves from being interested in but outside or on the boundary of modern Asian art, to becoming a country which serves as a site for giving this its overdue or coming prominence in world art, to Japan becoming a kind of centre - albeit among the famous others of Europe and North America - which it has long thought itself worthy of constituting.

Nanjô Fumio considers that the issues of the Japan Foundation symposia over the last 10 years to have been: What is Asian art? What is art in Asia? Why introduce Asian art in Japan? Here Nanjô wants to consider 'how should Asia from now on grasp its own culture and how should Asia to send it out to the world?'.<sup>26</sup> He sees the plurality of Asia now beginning to have importance in a post-modern, post-colonial world. This is a world gradually being torn between globalism in politics and economy and dissolving, subdividing regional cultures. But the lack of unification in Asia as seen by European Union, may cause an Asia which is late to catch up to be exploited by the EU and the massive N. American market. Nanjô thinks there is great opposition to Japan leading a single Asia in opposition to this. But even if Asia thus lacks unity, it is able to contribute various forms, ideas, viewpoints, techniques, themes. Because of this lack of unity but valuable plurality Nanjo considers

*It better to leave the definition and meaning of Asia vague, rather than someone deliberately defining its meaning and geographical extension. For him it would be better to leave Asia as a 'continuing puzzle' in the same way as Said labelled Orientalism as the incomprehensible other of Europe. Art is the more attractive and significant the less it is incomprehensible because it is indeed a curiosity for the heterogenous which dwells within an interest in art. It is a position which is ambiguously close to Tatehata's and not far from earlier Japanese formulations of the role of Japan as an historical storehouse of Asian culture.<sup>27</sup>*

From Nanjô's statements about Japan and modern Asian art, it is very easy to see the way early 20th century Japanese cultural domination of Asia has elided, through being the store of values (and their privileged re-propagator as under ultranationalism), in the late 20th century into a purportedly neutral cultural access to and for Asia through the Japanese assembling of information and art works:

*If Japan has a role to play it is as a function for the cultural 'archive', that is to present one site from which to collect, expose, dialogue with and accumulate. And further to send a message about the results of this to the wide world'.<sup>28</sup>*

## Conclusion: Scale and Nature of Exhibition Activities

Perhaps it will become possible in a few years to make very broad and meaningful conclusions about the relationship between modern Japanese art and modern Asian art as they mutually develop. Given the scale of the issues and the amount of information required to do so, I am personally inclined to restraint in this area for the present.

However, I have tried to list up most of the major exhibitions of modern Asian art in Japan during the 1990s in the chronology in Appendix Thirteen and the bibliography in Appendix Fourteen. This does not list the one-person or group exhibitions at

commercial galleries such as Satani and Tokyo or loan galleries such as Maki/Tamura, or sponsored galleries run or financed by large corporations like Canon, KDD or NTT. So the coverage is mostly of exhibitions in public galleries. Some Japanese curators active in this field are listed in Appendix Fifteen. I have not been able to systematically list Japanese curators sent to overseas Biennales in Asia and the Pacific, including the role of Japanese advisors to the Brisbane Asia-Pacific Triennale. But it should be noted that curators like Kuroda, Mizusawa, Nakamura, Nanjô, Tatehata, and several others have all been active in taking Japanese artists to Brisbane, Dacca, Kwangju, New Delhi, and Sydney. Unlike most of their European and North American counterparts these curators have also frequently been involved in, if not acted directly as curators for, exhibitions in Japan of modern Asian art.

The materials in the appendix are capable of many kinds of augmentation and different types of analysis. But they do even in their present state allow some limited generalizations.

Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, there has been a tremendous scale of activity which has increased in depth and factual understanding as well as range of modern Asian art works exhibited unseen anywhere else.

Secondly, because Japanese curators have been active in securing representative works and are aware of their own modern art history, they have not suffered from the limiting historical vulgarity of many non-Japanese curators of modern and contemporary art. At least in the 1990s, in modern Asian art the 'modern' was not somehow to be shut off from the 'contemporary', although in 2001 the time may now be seen to have arrived to do so. Indeed perhaps because of the very limitations in perceived Japanese public interest and knowledge, at least until the last few years, many of the Japanese exhibitions had included a pedagogical element which has allowed the 'contemporary' to emerge from the early modern and modern art in which it has always been embedded.

Thirdly, this willingness to allow the 'modern' a history as the emplacement of the

'contemporary' is a trajectory which has not always been found among Japanese artists, or among the more self-proclaimedly 'contemporary' Japanese art curators who have as a rule been more interested in the products of New York and Düsseldorf than New Guinea or Dacca. There is a market for cultural goods in Japan which for most of the time since 1945 has been dominated by Europe and North America. Whether the new interest in modern Asian art has to be solely linked to the end of the Cold War in politics, to a new sense of wealth and technological innovation driven by economy, or to deeper cultural shifts in mass self-perception relativised by a new positioning of 'others' is yet to be fully understood.

## APPENDIX ONE

### Chronology of texts and exhibitions

(simplified entries, full details are in the bibliography below)

- 1957 *1st Young Asian Artists Exhibition*, Japan Cultural Forum.
- 1961 January, *Modern Art of Asia: New Movements and Old Tradition*, Japan Cultural Forum.
- 1973 Masuda Yoshinobu, Japanese representative of the International Artists' Association (IAA), speaks at the UNESCO Asia Cultural Cabinet Ministers' Conference in Yogyakarta, for the need to respect particularity in art.
- 1977 Planning for an Asian Art Exhibition substituted for an American Art exhibition on request of Shindo Kazuma, mayor of Fukuoka (former head of Gen'yosha, a political group dissolved by SCAP in 1948 as right-wing). This led to accusations the exhibition was 'a re-manifestation of the Great East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere'. But planning committee included many local artists. Various groups sent to Asia to investigate through auspices of IAA's Japan committee.
- 1979 Opening of Fukuoka Art Museum. November, *Dai 1-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten, Indo, Chugoku, Nihon / 1st Asian Artists Exhibition, Part I, India, China, Japan*, Fukuoka.
- 1980 November, *Dai 1-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten, Ajia Gendai Bijutsu / 1st Asian Artists Exhibition Part II, Contemporary Asian Art*, Fukuoka. (collectively 13 countries, 471 artists, 470 works)
- 1985 November, *Dai 2-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten / 2nd Asian Art Show*, Fukuoka. (13 countries, 264 artists, 368 works)
- 1986 Indian Triennale, Nakamura Hideki, Japan Commissioner  
Bangla Desh Asia Modern Art Biennale, Nakamura Hideki, Japan Commissioner.
- 1988 January, *Roberto Feleo* (Philippines), Fukuoka.  
September, *He Duoling* (China), Fukuoka
- 1989 July, *Dai 3-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten, nichijo no naka no jochosei / 3rd Asian Art Show, symbolic visions in contemporary Asian life*, Fukuoka. (15 countries,

- 103 artists, 233 works)
- 1990 The Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center founded.  
 February, *Monogatari no sumu miya - ASEAN no Gendai Bijutsu / Narrative Visions in Contemporary ASEAN Art*, Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture Center.  
 February, *Tawan Duchanee* (Thailand), Fukuoka.  
 May, *Dento - Insupireeshon no gensen / Tradition, the source of Inspiration*, 1st ASEAN symposium on aesthetics, Fukuoka & Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center.  
 December, *Shingapooru Gendai Bijutsi Ni'nin Ten / A New Generation in Singapore Art* (Baet Yeok Kuan, Lim Poh Teck), Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture Center.  
 December, *Tan Chinkwan* (Chen Zhenquan, Malaysia), Fukuoka
- 1991 Indian Triennale, Nakamura Hideki, Japan Commissioner.  
 September, *Tang Dawu* (Singapore), Fukuoka.
- 1992 September, *Tonan Ajia no Niuu Aato: Bijutsu Zensen hokujocho-ten / New Art from Southeast Asia 1992*, The Japan Foundation.
- 1993 March, *Rashid Araeen*, (Pakistan (sic)), Fukuoka.
- 1994 February, *Dhruva Mistry* (India), Fukuoka.  
 March, *Sai Kokkyo: kan taiheiyo yori / Cai Guoqiang - from the Pan Pacific*, Iwaki.  
 September, *Ajia no sozoryoku, dai 3-bu, ajia no instareeshon / Creativity in Asian Art Now, Part 3: Asian Installation Work*, Hiroshima.  
 September, *Dai 4-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten;Jidai wo mitsumeru me / 4th Asian Art Show: Realism as Attitude* (lit.: eyes that stare at the times), Fukuoka (18 countries, 48 artists, 123 works)  
 October, *The Potential of Asian Thought*, The Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center.
- 1995 February, *Kofuku Genso: Ajia no Gendai Bijutsu Sakkatachi / Visions of Happiness, Ten Contemporary Asian Artists*, Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture Centre.

March, *Moko*, (Indonesia), Fukuoka.

April, *Dai 4-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten / 4th Asian Art Show*, Tokyo, Setagaya Art Museum.

August, *New Asian Art Show 1995, China, Korea, Japan*. (Gallery Q)

September, *Kim Yonjin* (Korea), Fukuoka.

October, The Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center becomes The Japan Foundation Asian Cultural Center.

October, *Ajia no modanizumu - sono tayo na tenkai, Indoneshia, Fuiripin, Tai / Asian Modernism, diverse development in Indonesia, the Phillippines, and Thailand*, The Japan Foundation Asia Center

- 1996 February, *Seminar on Japanese Art Exchanges with Asia* for Japanese curators and critics, International Centre for Research in Japanese Studies, Kyoto.

March, *Ajia Sentaa News*, Sokango, Japan Foundation Asia Center.

November, *Fang Lijun*, Japan Foundation Asia Center.

- 1997 February, *Hantei Pham* (Vietnam, America), Fukuoka.

April, *Tonan Ajia 1997 kitaru beki bijutsu no tame ni / For Southeast Asian Art to come*, Tokyo, Museum of Contemporary Art.

May, *Tonan Ajia - Kindaibijutsu no Tanjo / The Birth of Modern Art in Southeast Asia*, Fukuoka etc.

August, *Indoneshia - rearizumu kaiga to sono henyo / The Mutation: Pains-taking Realism in Indonesian Contemporary Painting*, The Japan Foundation.

October, *Asian Contemporary Art Reconsidered*, The Japan Foundation Asia Center.

- 1998 July, *Neo-Lagoon Hokuto Ajia no Gendai Bijutsu / Neo Lagoon, Contemporary Art of North East Asia*, Niigata.

- 1999 March 6th, opening of Fukuoka Asian Art Museum.

March, *Dai 1-kai Fukuoka Ajia Bijutsu Toriennaare 1999 / The 1st Fukuoka Asian Art Triennale* (The 5th Asian Art Show), Fukuoka.

March, *Ajia no Bijutsu: Fukuoka Ajia Bijutsukan no Korekushon to sono katsudo*.



- April, *Higashi Ajia/ Kaiga no kindai - abura-e no tanjo to sono Tenkai / Oil Painting in East Asia- its awakening and development*, Shizuoka.
- 2000 October, *Heri Dono*: The Japan Foundation Asia Center.

## APPENDIX TWO

### Bibliography

(Materials below are given in chronological order of appearance; authors or curators are given first, then after the text title those named are participating artists or symposium speakers).

### General texts

- 1990 *Kokusai Koryu*, no.52, February 1990 (A special issue 'Tonan ajia to no taiwa', including Umesao Tadao, Ishii Yoneo, 'Tonan Ajia kara Nihon no Kokusaisei wo kangaeru')
- 1996 *Ajia Sentaa Niuusu*, Sokango, March 1996, includes Furuichi Yasuko, 'Mondai teiki toshite no "Ajia no Modanizumu" ten', Motoe Kunio, 'Modanizumu wa hitotsu de aru', Atsukawa Noriaki 'Indonesshia no "Modern" na jidai', Japan Foundation Asia Centre
- 1997 *Ajia Sentaa Niuusu*, no.6, August 1997 includes Furichi Yasuko, 'Tonan Ajia 1997, kitaru beki bijutsu not tame ni', and Dadang Christanto, Monthien Boonma 'Fashion de nai, shin no geijutsu koryu wo'
- 2000 *Ajia Yugaku / Intriguing Asia*, no 15, April 2000 (Special issue with selected articles from the 1999 symposium *Ajia no Bijutsu: Mirai he no shiten* by Furuichi Yasuko, Nakamura Hideki, Leng Lin, Seo Seongrok, Jim Supangkat, Ranjit Hoskote, David Elliott, Ahmad Mashadi, Apinan Poshyananda, Tatehata Akira, Miki Akiko, Mizusawa Tsutomu, Nanjo Fumio, Ushiroshoji Masahiro)

### Overall or thematic exhibitions of artists from more than one country

- 1961 Uemura Takashiyo et al, *Modern Art of Asia: New Movements and Old Traditions*, Tokyo, Japan Cultural Forum & Toto Shuppan, 1961
- 1990 *Monogatari no sumu mori - ASEAN no Gendai Bijutsu / Narrative Visions in Contemporary ASEAN Art*, Tokyo, Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture

Center, 1990 (Haji Marsidi bin Haji Akip, Awang bin Sitai, Haryadi Suadi, Ivan Sagito, Nyoman Meja, Ismail Abdul Latiff, Choong Kam-kow, Redza Piyadasa, Roberto Feleo, Oferia Gelvezon-Tequi, Julie Lluch-Dalena, Tang Da-wu, Tay Chee Toh, Wijit Apichatkriengkrai, Pratuang Emjaroen, Surasit Saoukong).

- 1990 *Dento - Insupireeshon no gensen / Tradition, the source of Inspiration*, 1<sup>st</sup> ASEAN symposium on Aesthetics: workshop and exhibition, Fukuoka, Fukuoka Art Museum & Tokyo, Japan Foundation ASEAN Cultural Center, 1990. (Othman Haji Moxsin, Haji Marsidi bin Haji Akip, Gung Wayan Tjidera, Tisna Sanjaya, Chew Tenbeng, Syed Thajudeen, Norma Belleza, Goh Beng-kwan, Tay Chee-toh, Prayat Pongdam, Sawasdi Tantisuk)
- 1992 Furuichi Yasuko, Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Sakonaka Yoko, et al *Tonan Ajia no Niuu Aato: Bijutsu Zensen hokujochu-ten / New Art from South east Asia 1992*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation, 1992 (Supachai Satsara, Tan Chin kuan, Mohd. Fauzin B. Mustaffa, Sansern Milindasuta, Chatchai Puipia, Lim Poh Teck, Zulikifli B. Ysoff, Heri Dono, Wong Hoy Cheong, Dadang Christanto, Abdul Malek bin Haji Metarsat, Norberto Roldan, Montien Boonma, Teguh, Osternik, Edson Armenta, Roberto G. Villanueva, Tang Da wu)
- 1994 Fukunaga Osamu, Miyatake Hiroshi, *Ajia no sozoryoku, dai 3-bu, ajia no instareeshon / Creativity in Asian Art Now, Part 3: Asian Installation Work*, Hiroshima, Hiroshima City Museum of Contemporary Art & Tokyo, Asahi Shim-bun, 1994 (Cai Guoqiang, Anish Kapoor, Kawamata Tadashi, Tang Dawu, Yanagi Yukinori, Yook Keun-Byung)
- Dai 4-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten / 4th Asian Art Show*, Fukuoka, Fukuoka Art Museum, 1994.
- 1995 Shimizu Toshio, *Kofuku Genso Ajia no Gendai Bijutsu Sakkatachi / Visions of Happiness, Ten Contemporary Asian Artists*, Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture Centre, 1995 (Fang Lijun, Feng Mengbo, Hri Dono, Sone Yuitaka, Choi Jeong Hwa, Wong Hoy Cheong, Reamillo & Juliet, Suzann Victor, Araya Rasdjarmreansook, Chatchai Puipia)

Endo Nozomi, *Dai 4-kai Ajia Bijutsu-ten / 4th Asian Art Show, Tokyo*, Setagaya Art Museum, 1995 (Dadang Christanto, Lee Wen, Hong Sung-min, Baet Yeok-kuan, Nakamura Masato, Navin Rawancchaikul, Heri Dono, Lim PohTeck, Cho Duck-hyun, Nilofar Akmut, Fuji Hiroshi, Choi Jeong-hwa, Kiran Manandhar, Surjeet Kaur Choyal, Ahama Shukri Mohamed, Dao Hung, Jack Kulaasingh, Sikounnavong Kanha, Min Wae Aung, Tran Hoang-co, Pg. Timbang Pg. Haji Tuah, Raja Shahrman Raja Aziddin, Kade Javanalikhorn, Noel Cuzon, Fang Lijun, Elmer Borlongan, Gulam mohammed Sheikh, Md. Amirul Momanin Chowdhury, Tsagaandarlin Enkjargal, LuShengzhong, Tani Arata, Minamishima Hiroshi, Huang Zhuang, Yoon Jin-sup, *New Asian Art Show 1995, China, Korea, Japan*, Tokyo, Committee of International Contemporary Art (Gallery Q) 1995 (Wang Luyan, Wang Jianwei, Wei Guangqing, Wang Youshen, Wang Guangyi, Song Dong, Li Yongbin, Yang Jun, Chu (Qiu) Julia Nee, Lee Kyung-keun, Kim Hoon, Paark Cahng Shik, Hwang Min Soo, Jheon Soo Cheon, Kwon Yeo Hyun, Ahn Pi Yun, Lee Bul, Kim Kyung Han, Abe Mamoru, Nishi Makaaki, Misawa Kenji, Takahashi Kan, Ueda Yuzo, Miyamae Masaki, Hachiya Kazuhiko, Saito Minako, Nakayama Daisuke)

Tatehata Akira, Mizusawa Tsutomu, Shioda Jun'ichi, et al, *Ajia no modanizumu - sono tayo na tenkai, Indoneshia, Fuiripin, Tai / Asian Modernism, diverse development in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 1995 (Indonesia: Raden Saleh Syarief Bustaman, S. Soedjono, Affandi, Mochtar Apin, Ahmad Sadali, Srihadi Soedarsono, Gregorius Sidgarta Soegiyo, Abdul Djalil Pirous, F.X.Haarsono, Bachtiar Zainoel, Nyoman Nuarta, Dede Eri Supria, Anuspati, Tisna Sanjaya, Nindityo Adipurno; Philippines: Jose Honorato Lozano, Felix Resurreccion Hidalgo, Juan Luna, Simon Flores y de la Rosa, Fernando Amorsolo, Victorio Edades, Galo B. Ocampo, Hernando R. Ocampo, Vicente Mansala, Cesar Legaspi, Arturo Luz, Guillermo Tolentino, Napoleon Abueva, Ben Cabrera, Imelda Cajipe-Endaya, Julie Lluch, Roberto Feleo, Charlie Co; Thailand: Khrua In Khong, Phra Soralakikhit, Silpa Bhirasri, Fue

Hariphitak, Jitr Buabusaaya, Khien Yimsiri, Tawee Nandakwang, Sawasdi Tantisuk, Prayura Ukuchadha, Chalood Nimsamer, Sompot Upa-in, Chang Se Tang, Pratung Emjaroen, Pichai Nirand, Thawan Duchanee, Monthien Boonma, Vasan Sitthiket]

- 1997 Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Rawanchaikul Toshiko, *Tonan Ajia - Kindaibijutsu no Tanjo / The Birth of Modern Art in Southeast Asia*, Fukuoka, Fukuoka Art Museum (and other locations), 1997 (a major historical survey exhibition, there are too many artists to conveniently list here)

Shioda Jun'ichi, Fukunaga Osamu, Furuichi Yasuko., et al, *Tonan Ajia 1997 kitaru beki bijutsu no tame ni*, Tokyo, Museum of Contemporary Art, 1997 (Brenda V. Fajardo, Chandrasekan, Liew Kung yu, Monthien Boonma, Navin production Co. Ltd., Agus Suwage, Chatchai Puipia, Eng Hwee chu, Imelda Cajipe-Endaya, Pinaree Sanpitak, Wong Hoy Cheong, Arahmaiani, Dadang Christanto, Moelyono, Nunelucio Alvarado, Sanggawa, Semsar Siahaan,

- 1998 Tatehata Akira, *Neo-Lagoon Hokuto Ajia no Gendai Bijutsu / Neo Lagoon, Contemporary Art of North East Asia*, Niigata, Niigata Prefecture Civic Center Gallery, 1998

[(Russia) Vitaliy Dozdov, Anatoliy Nezhinsky, Andrey Blazhnov; (Mongolia) Jondonjunai Dalh-Ochir, Sereter Dagvadorj, Galsandorjin Erdenbileg, (China) Jie Pu, Ping Sun, Lin Tianmiao, (Korea) Yook Taejin, Ahn Sumgkeum, Park Sil, (Japan) Sakazume Katusyuki, Sekine Tetsuo, Furukawa Chisen, Hoshino Satoru, Honda Shingo].

- 1999 Kuroda Raiji, Ushiroshoji Masahiro et al, *Dai 1-kai Fukuoka Ajia Bijutsu Toriennaare 1999 / The 1st Fukuoka Asian Art Triennale* (The 5th Asian Art Show), Fukuoka, Fukuoka Asian Art Museum.

Ochi Yujiro et al, *Higashi Ajia/ Kaiga no kimndai - abura-e no tanjo to sono Tenkai / Oil Painting in East Asia - its awakening and development*, Shizuoka, Shizuoka Prefecutral Art Museum, 1999

#### Exhibitions from one country

- 1990 *Shingapooru Gendai Bijutsi Ni'nin Ten / A New Generation in Singapore*

*Art (Baet Yeok Kuan, Lim Poh Teck)*, Japan Foundation ASEAN Culture Center, 1990

- 1997 Supangkat, Jim, *Indonেশia-rearizumu kaiga to sono henyo / The Mutation: Painsaking Realism in Indonesian Contemporary Painting*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation, 1997. (Dede Eri Supria, Rahmat S. Irfani, Melodia, Chusin Setyadikara, Probo, Sudarisman, Agus Kamal, Lucia Hartini, Ivan Sagito, Sutjipto Adi, Asri Nugroho)

#### Exhibitions of Individual Artists

- 1994 Hirano Akihiko, Takeuchi Hiroko, *Sai Kokkyo: kantaiheiyo yori / Cai Guoqiang from the Pan Pacific*, Iwaki, Iwaki City Art Museum, 1994.
- 1996 Tatehata Akira, *Fang Lijun*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 1996.
- 2000 Poshyananda, Apinan, *Heri Dono: Dancing demons and Drunken Deities*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 2000.

#### Symposia

- 1994 *The Potential of Asian Thought*, Tokyo, Kokusai Koryukikin ASEAN bunka sentaa, 1994 (Cai Guoqiang, Alice Guillermo, Kuroda Rajji, Li Xianting, Miyajima Tatsuo, Nakamura Hideki, Ono Ikuhiko, Ozaki Masato, Apinan Poshyananda, Shimizu Toshio, Shioda Jun'ichi, Jim Supangkat, Tani Arata, Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Zulkifli B. Yusof)
- 1997 *Saiko: Ajia Gendai Bijutsu Asian Contemporary Art Reconsidered*, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 1997 (John Clark, Vishaka N. Desai, Kwok Kian chow, Lee Yongwoo, Hung Liu, Mizusawa Tsutomu, Murakami Takashi, Nakahara Yusuke, Apinan Poshyananda, Tatehata Akira, Caroline Truner, Ushiroshoji Masahiro)
- 1999 *Ajia no Bijutsu Mirai he no shiten / Asian Art: Prospects for the Future*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 1999. (Leng Lin, Seo Seongrok, Jim Supangkat, Ranjit Hoskote, David Elliott, Rhana Devenport, Ahmad Mashadi, Nakamura Hideki, Apinan Poshyananda, Nitrangan Rajah, Tatehata Akira, Miki Akiko, Nanjo Fumio, Mizusawa Tsutomu, Shimizu Toshio, Shioda Junichi, Tani Arata, Ushiroshoji Masahiro)

#### Other catalogues:

Turner, Caroline, et al, *Beyond the Future: The Third Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art*, Brisbane, Queensland Art Gallery, 1999.

### APPENDIX THREE

#### Japanese Curators, Critics, and Academics active in promoting modern art links with Asia

Even by 1996 the number of Japanese art critics and curators involved with Asian art exchanges was quite considerable. For further reference I include here a list of those active which I drew up in 1996 when I was at the International Research Institute for Japanese Studies in Kyoto where I initiated a seminar on Modern Asian Art and Japan which invited many such curators.

Notes: This list indicates countries, exhibitions, and in some cases linguistic competence. It has also benefited from suggestions by Kuroda Raiji and Furuichi Yasuko.

Some level of linguistic competence	*
Japan Foundation	JF
Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs	JMFA

#### Countries:

China:	c
Korea:	k
Taiwan:	tw
Hong Kong:	hk
Vietnam:	v
Cambodia:	ca
Laos:	l
Thailand:	th
Myanmar:	my
Malaysia:	ma
Brunei:	br

Singapore	si
Indonesia:	is
Phillipines:	p
India:	ia
Bangla Desh:	bd
Pakistan:	p

Exhibitions/Symposia:

(This list overlaps with the chronology given above but is retained here as it stands because of the way it allows particular exhibitions to be linked with particular curators).

Asian Art Fukuoka	I	
	II	
	III	
	IV	
	1994	aaf-94
India Triennale	1968	iat-68
	1971	iat-83
	1975	iat-75
	1978	iat-78
	1982 (none?)	
	1986	iat-86
	1991	iat-91
	10.1994	iat-94
Bangladesh Biennale	1981	bdb-81
	1983	bdb-83
	1986	bdb-86
	1989	bdb-89
	1991	bdb-91
	1993	bdb-93
Bangladesh Biennial	10.1995	bdb-95
Asia Pacific Triennale	9.1993	apt-93

5.1990 Tradition,the source of inspiration	sea-90
7.1991 Edgar Talusan Fernandez	p-91
4.1992 Contemporary Malaysian Art	my-92
9/12.1992 New Art from SE Asia	nsea-92
6.1993 Facing Infinite Space	si-93
9.1994 Asian Art Now	aan-94
10.1994 Potential of Asian Thought	I 16.00, 14.10.1994 pat-94I II 10.15, 15.10.1994 pat-94II III 14.00, 15.10.1994 pat-94III IV 16.45, 15.10.1994 pat-94IV
2.1995 Visions of Happiness	vh-95
3.1995 Art Express, Ima Ajia no Geijutsu	ae-95
4/5 1995 4th Asian Art Show	aas-95
8/9.1995 Circulating Currents- Japan/Korea	jk-95
10.1995 Asian Modernism:	ampth-95

#### Major curators and critics

(by date of first public participation)

Chiba Shigeo, Tokyo Kokuritsu Kindai Bijutsukan	k, ch-80s
Haryu Ichiro, critic	c-70s, 80s
Honma Masayoshi	iat-68
Kitazono Noriaki, critic	
Kuroda Raiji, Fukuoka Shi Bijutsukan	bdb-91, bdb-95,aaf-94, pat-94III. ae-95
Minemura Toshiaka, Tama Bijutsu Daigaku	tw-80s, iat-94
Mizusawa Tsutomu, Kamakura Kindai Bijutsukan	bdb-92, ampth-95
Nakahara Yusuke, critic,	k-80s
Nakamura Hideki, critic,	bdb-86, iat-86, iat-91, p-91, my-92, nasea-92, si-93, pat-94I, pat-94IV
Oshima Seiji	iat-78
Segi Shinichi	bdb-81
Shimizu Toshio, Mito Geijutsukan	pat-94III,-pat-94IV, vh-95



Shioda Jun'ichi, Tokyoto Gendai Bijutsukan	pat-94I, pat-94IV, ampth-95,
Tani Arata, critic	nasea-92, pat-94II, pat-94IV
Tatehata Akira, Tama Bijutsu Daigaku	k, ampth-95, ae-95,
Tomiya Hideo	iat-71, iat-75
Tono Yoshiaki	bdb-89
Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Fukuoka Shi Bijutsukan,	sea-90, nasea-92, aaf-94, pat-94I
Yasunaga Koichi, Fukuoka Shi Bijutsukan	bdb-83

#### Central government and other officials

Ando Kazuo, JF (New Delhi)	my, nasea-92
Furuichi Yasuko, JF (Asian Center)	nasea-92
Honda Shiro (Toyota Foundation)	p, nasea-92
Kanai Atsushi, JF (Asia Center)	is, nasea-92
Komimiya Hiroshi, JMFA	br, nesea-92
Kurashige Takako	si, nasea-92
Nakajima Masato (Administrator, Hiroshima)	my, nasea-92
Ono Ikuhiko, JMFA	
Sakonaka Yasuko, Hiroshima Shi Bijutsukan (librarian)	nasea-92
Suzuki Tsutomu, JF (Asia Center)	th, nasea-92

#### Journalists and Media

Miyagawa Kyoji, Nihon Keizai Shinbun	
Obigane Akio, Asahi Shinbum Shakai Bunka Kikakukyoku	aan-94
Onishi Wakato, Asahi Shinbum	
Sanda Haruo, Mainichi Shinbun	
Sugawara Haruo, Yomiuri Shinbun	
Tanaka Sanzô, Asahi Shinbun	
Uchida Hideyoshi, Asahi Shinbum Shakai Bunka Kikakukyoku	aan-94

#### Other interested curators and critics

Eiraku Tôru, Shiga Kenritsu Bijutsukan	ia,
--	-----

Endo Nozomi, Setagaya Bijutsukan	aas-95
Fukunaga Osamu, Hiroshima Gendai Bijutsukan	aan-94
Hagiwara Hiroko, Osaka Women's University	
Haido Masahiko, Aichi Ken Bijutsukan	jk-95
Harada Akira, Kamakura Kindai Bijutsukan	c
Harasawa Akiko, Nagoya Shi Bijutsukan	jk-95
Hirano Akihiko, Iwaki Shi Bijutsukan	c
Ikeda Toshiko, Fukukoka Shi Bijutsukan	c*
Kanazawa Takeshi, critic	k,apt-93
Makino Ken'ichiro, Aichi Ken Bijutsukan	jk-95
Miura Masashi, Critic and journalist	t, ae-95
Miyatake Hiroshi, Hiroshima Gendai Bijutsukan	aan-94
Nakamura Giichi, Critic	t
Nakamura Makoto, Saitama Kenritsu Kindai Bijutsukan	
Ogura Masashi, critic	
Okabe Masayuki, Teikyô Daigaku	c,ia,k,tw
Shimazaki Yoshinobu, Tokyo International Forum Art Work Project]	
Tachibana Yoshiaki, Shizuoka Kenritsu Bijutsukan	tw*
Teshigawara Jun, Setagaya Bijutsukan	
Tsunoda Minako, Nagoya Shi Bijutsukan	jk-95
Tsuruta Takeyoshi, historian	c*
Tsuzuki Etsuko, Fukuoka Shi Bijutsukan	
Yamaguchi Yumiko, writer (assisting Yook Keunbyung)	
Yamamura Midori, (working for late Roberto Villanueva)	
Yamawaki Kazuo, Nagoya Shi Bijutsukan	jk-95

#### Independent curators and dealers

Kitagawa Furamu (Fram), dealer (Art Front Gallery)	c,
Namikawa Emiko, dealer (Lunami Gallery)	
Nanjo Fumio, independent curator, critic and dealer (Nanjô Associates)	c,
Ônishi Toshikatsu dealer, (Base Gallery)	

Tabata Yoshibito,dealer (Tokyo Gallery)	k (from 1973), c
Yamada Yûzo, dealer (Gallery Q & Kwak Insuk Project)	
Yamamoto Hozu, dealer (Tokyo Gallery)	k (from 1973), c
Yamagishi Nob	

## Notes

- 1 For example, I only have a few issues of indicative publications such as the *Ajia Sentaa Niussu*. Although these were supposedly available via the web from the Japan Foundation website, I was unable to date to open the document.
- 2 See Furuichi Yasuko, 'Nijūisseiki e - *Ajia no Gendai Bijutsu*' in *Ajia Yugaku* no 15, April 2000, who tellingly writes, 'Countries blessed with modern institutions such as Japan and Australia will at the same time as playing an effective role in the activity of artists are in result becoming a repressive authority..', p.3. Ms Furuichi has for a long time been a very influential administrator with the Japan Foundation's ASEAN and later Asia Cultural Centers.
- 3 In the list of 'Preliminary Selected Artists' of 15th November 2000 no Australian artists were chosen for Yokohama (and only one New Zealand artist, Jacqueline Fraser) and it was only after that I understand the internal choice to include Stellarc was made, apparently in January 2001. Despite his previous name - and exhibition - value in Japan where he worked for a number of years, it is unlikely he would have been on a list of recommended artists by an Australian curator specializing in contemporary art, as any brief examination of Australian artists selected for the Venice Biennale in recent years would suggest. Later Destiny Deacon was thought to have been included. In May 2001, it subsequently has been made known in various overseas art worlds that the Triennale will be composed of four separate exhibitions, curated by four separate curators, Komoto Shinji, Tatehata Akira, Nakamura Nobuo, and Nanjo Fumio. At the Triennale website <http://www.jpff.go.jp/yt2001/2/info.html> on 1st May 2001, no Australian artists had even then been publicly announced.
- 4 See Aoki etc
- 5 Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Chief Curator of the Fukuoka Asian Art Museum in his essay in the *Ajia Yugaku* no.15, 2000, p.90, comes very close to affirming this position.
- 6 This trajectory is indicated by the exhibition of Lee U-fan (himself resident in Japan since 1956) at Tokyo Gallery in 1970, various Chinese artists including Xu Bing at the same Tokyo Gallery in 1994 etc (check), and that of Navin Rawanchaikul (whose Japanese wife is a curator at Fukuoka Asian Art Museum) at Satani Gallery in 1999.
- 7 Interestingly, the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs changed its administrative organization to include Oceania, Australia, and New Zealand as one section (*Taiyoshu-ka*) among the seven sections of its Asia Bureau (*Ajia-kyoku*) in 2001. See Chuo shocho kaikaku kenkyukai henshu, *Chuo Shocho Saihen*, Tokyo, Gyosei Shuppan, 2001, p.73, p.77. I am grateful to Kathryn Hunyor, Australian Embassy, Tokyo for obtaining a copy of these pages.  
The Japan Foundation aside from its regional offices including that in Sydney has no special programme or bureaucratic structure for Oceania including Australia. This is unlike its Center for Global Partnership (founded in 1991) focussed on the USA, its Asia Center (founded in 1995 following on from the ASEAN Center in 1990 and which excludes Oceania and Australia from its focus and exhibitions), and its Special programs for Japan-Europe Exchange from 1993. This information is obtainable via the Japan Foundation's website at <http://www.jpff.go.jp/e/about/org.html>. Ms Furuichi in a personal communication to Kath Hunyor stated that the Japan Foundation Asia Center did include Australia in the purview of its activities, but could advance

no documentation where this is stated.

- 8 The 'zone which is the object of the Asian Art Museum is East Asia, Southeast Asia, and Southwest Asia (it does not include the Pacific, Oceania, the Middle East or Central Asia)..'. Ushiroshoji Masahiro, 'Fukuoka Ajia Bijutsukan no korekushon ni tsuite', in Ushiroshoji Masahiro, Kuroda Raiji, Rawanchaikul Toshiko, *Ajia no Bijutsu: Fukuoka Ajia Bijutsukan no Korekushon to sono katsudo*, Tokyo, Bijutsu shuppansha 1999, p.7. Interestingly Ushiroshoji's exclusion in the *Ajia Yugaku* no.15, 2000 Special Issue, p.91 specifies 'the object is the broad scope of the Asian region from Pakistan in the West, Mongolia in the North to Indonesia in the South (excluding the Middle East and Central Asia)', that is it does not there refer to the exclusion of the Pacific or Oceania. Whether this indicates that the Asian Art Museum might broaden its scope to include the Pacific in future is not clear.
- 9 Furuichi, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.2.
- 10 Furuichi, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.3.
- 11 Judgement by outsiders about Japanese self-perceptions of institutional strength or weakness should be restrained. However, it remains a fact that curators from Japan have arrived in Australia to give lectures on Japanese art practice which they thought advanced, or to see art institutions they thought backward by Japanese standards, only to find what they presented was regarded as out of date - sometimes by twenty to thirty years - in the experience of the Australian art world, or that the art galleries they visited were of a far larger scale and with better facilities than some national galleries in Japan. Perhaps cultural exchange was not helped by the fact that the Australian hosts on several occasions were intimately aware of the gap between Japanese expectations and the realities the visitors had to adjust to, rather too rapidly for their comfort, and that this awareness was only with great discomfort noticed by their Japanese guests.
- 12 As for example the notorious statement by the Japanese Minister of Justice about the 1938 Nanjing massacre. There is also the tiresome inability in many political circles to call 'end of the war' a 'defeat' (*shusen* not *haisen*), or the persistent description in history book controversies of Japan's 'advance' and not its 'aggression' after 1938 (*shinko* not *shinryaku*).
- 13 Clearly this was one of the intentions underlying the use of Japanese examples in my own book *Modern Asian Art*, Sydney, Fine Arts Press & Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1998.
- 14 Ushiroshoji, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.91.
- 15 Mizusawa Tsutomu, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.85.
- 16 Mizusawa, *ibid.*
- 17 Mizusawa, *ibid.*
- 18 Furuichi in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.3.
- 19 Tatehata in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.79.
- 20 Nakamura Hideki in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.5
- 21 Nakamura Hideki in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.11.
- 22 In *Ajia no Bijutsu: Mirai e no shiten / Asian Art: Prospects for the Future*, Tokyo, The Japan Foundation Asia Center, 1999, p.109-11.
- 23 Interview with Tatehata Akira at [http://www.jpfa.go.jp/yt2001/e/art02\\_1.html](http://www.jpfa.go.jp/yt2001/e/art02_1.html) as of 1st May 2001.
- 24 Interview with Tatehata Akira at [http://www.jpfa.go.jp/yt2001/e/art02\\_1.html](http://www.jpfa.go.jp/yt2001/e/art02_1.html) as of 1st May 2001.

25 Furuichi, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.4.

26 Nanjo, in *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, 2000, p.85.

27 The position is above all indebted to Okakura Tenshin (Kakuzo) whose *The Ideals of the East*, London John Murray, 1904, was originally written in English.

28 Nanjo, *Ajia Yugaku*, no.15, p.88.